

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,494	04/05/2001	Roger S. Brown	5181-86600	6832
	90 10/06/2004		EXAMINER	
B. Noel Kivlin			CASIANO, ANGEL L	
Conley, Rose,	& Tayon, P.C.			
P.O. Box 398			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Austin, TX 78767-0398			2182	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*			อ/.
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1)00
Advisory Action	09/828,494	BROWN ET AL.	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Angel L Casiano	2182	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	opears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 August 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required t final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Ap Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	o avoid abandonment of this appli :: (1) a timely filed amendment wh peal (with appeal fee); or (3) a tim	cation. A proper re ich places the appli	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing da b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorte (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1 dension and the corresponding amount of the ened statutory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. 136(a) and the appropriate the fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37		-	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:		
(a) \( \square\) they raise new issues that would require fu	rther consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see No	te below);		
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application</li><li>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	on in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without can NOTE:	celing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ould be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ reques application in condition for allowance because		sidered but does N	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed SOLELY	f to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follo	ws:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4-6,9-13,18-31 and 34</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a)	approved or b)□ disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State	ment(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:	1/1/		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Advisory Action TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Part of Paper No. 20040929

Application No.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Accordingly, Examiner respectfully maintains his position as stated in previous Office action. Regarding claim 1, Examiner admits that Sudhakaran does not teach the step of "verifying the validity of the configuration information". However, the combination of references (in view of Cepulis) teaches or suggests the elements in the claim. Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine the references in the manner presented.